1	SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SCBN 9990) United States Attorney		
2 3	BRIAN J. STRETCH (CABN 163973) Chief, Criminal Division		
4	JOSHUA B. EATON (CABN 196887) Assistant United States Attorney		
5 6 7	450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-0805 Facsimile: (415) 436-7234 josh.eaton@usdoj.gov		
8 9	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
12	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
13 14			
	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	CR No. 3-07-70396-JL
15	Plaintiff,)	[PROPOSED] ORDER AND STIPULATION
16	v.		EXCLUDING TIME FROM AUGUST 30, 2007 TO SEPTEMBER 17, 2007
17	JEFFREY BENJAMIN HARRISON,)	
18	Defendant.)	
19)	
20			
21	With the agreement of the parties, and with the consent of the defendant, the Court enters thi		
22	order extending the time for the preliminary hearing under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure		
23	5.1, and extending the 30-day time period for indictment and excluding time under the Speedy		
24	Trial Act (18 U.S.C. § 3161) from August30, 2007 to September 17, 2007. The parties agree,		
25	and the Court finds and holds, as follows:		
26	1. The defendant is presently charged by criminal complaint for a violation of 18 U.S.C.		
27	§2252(a)(4)(B) and (a)(1). Currently, the matter is scheduled for a preliminary examination or		
28	arraignment on September 17, 2006.		
	Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Evaluding Time - C	'D 3 /	07.70396.H

///

///

///

- 2. The parties request and stipulate herein that: (a) with the defendant's consent, the twenty-day time limit for a preliminary hearing or indictment under F.R.Crim.P. 5.1(a), (c), and (d) be extended; and (b) time be excluded from calculation of the thirty-day time limit for information or indictment under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(b).
- 3. The parties make this request because the United States has provided and will continue to make discovery available to defense counsel and thus defense counsel needs time to review those materials, meet with the defendant and determine how to proceed. Specifically, defense counsel and the United States continue to discuss whether a pre-charge disposition is appropriate. Only after evaluating the evidence will counsel be in a position to evaluate what disposition is an appropriate one. Defense counsel also believes it is his best interest to negotiate the case pre-indictment, and he cannot do that without evaluating the evidence. Accordingly, the extension and exclusion are required for effective preparation of defense counsel.
- 3. The Court finds that there is good cause for the extension under F.R.Crim.P. 5.1, and the exclusion under 18 U.S.C. § 3161, and that the ends of justice served by granting this continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and of the defendant in a speedy trial and the prompt disposition of criminal cases. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A). The Court further finds that failure to grant the continuance would deny counsel for all parties reasonable time necessary for effective preparation taking into account the exercise of due diligence under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).
- 4. Accordingly, and with the consent of the defendant, the Court (1) sets a date before the duty magistrate judge on September 17, 2007, at 9:30 a.m., for setting a date for preliminary hearing and (2) orders that the period from August 30, 2007, to September 17, 2007, be excluded from the time period for preliminary hearings under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1 and from Speedy Trial Act calculations under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) & (B)(iv).

///

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

DATED: SEPTEMBER 14, 2007

/S/ JOSHUA B. EATON Assistant United States Attorney

DATED: SEPTEMBER 14, 2007

EDWIN PRATHER
Attorney for JEFFREY HARRISON

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 9/17/7

THE-MON Judge Joseph C. Spero